

III. REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed September 14, 2001 ("the Office Action"). Claims 1 and 5-7 have been amended. Hence, claims 1 and 5-11 are currently pending. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Drawings

In paragraph three (3) of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to due to informalities in Figure 15. Two copies of an amended Figure 15 are attached, with the proposed changes circled in one copy. Applicants therefore believe that the drawing objection has been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In paragraph four (4) of the Office Action, claims 5-11 were rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. The subject matter of original claim 5 has been incorporated into independent claim 1. Further, claim 1 has been amended to provide structural cooperation for the locking mechanism, "a locking mechanism connected to at least one of the first or second table." Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 objection has been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph six (6) of the Office Action, claims 1 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,116,249 to Shiotani et al. ("Shiotani et

al.”). As stated in the previous section, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 5, among other things. As amended, claim 1 provides for the lever extending from the plane defined by the first surface when in the unlocked position. This obstruction facilitates the safety of the operator as the table saw may not be conveniently used with the second table unlocked. Shiotani et al. does not disclose or suggest a lever extending from the plane of the first surface; in contrast, the lever of Shiotani extends in the same plane as the table surface. Claims 5-7 ultimately depend from claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and claims 5-7 are proper for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In paragraph eight (8) of the Office Action, claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in light of U.S. Patent 5,116,249 issued to Shiotani et al. Claims 8-11 ultimately depend from claim 1. As stated in the previous section, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Shiotani et al. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-11, as they depend from claim 1, are also proper for allowance.

New Claim

New claim 56 has been added herein. No new matter has been introduced via the addition of new claim 56. Claim 56 includes the limitation of the locking handle extending from the plane defined by the surface of the first table, as is thus believed to be proper for allowance.

Conclusion

As evidenced by the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to each issue raised in the Office Action. All of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Early passage to issuance is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 952.474.3701 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Gicason
Reg. No. 39,998
Attorney for Applicants

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE
750 Bering Drive
Houston, Texas 77057
(952) 474-3701

Date:

12/14/01